DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 070 SP 015 804

TITLE District Facilitator Project. E.S.E.A. Title IV-C. Final Evaluation Report. 1979.
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jan 80
NOTE 40p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; Delivery Systems; Educational Resources; Elementary Secondary Education; *Information Dissemination; Inservice Teacher Education; Linking Agents; Needs Assessment; *Pilot Projects; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Public Schools; *Staff Development; *Validated Programs

ABSTRACT

The District Facilitator Project (DFP) assists local schools by linking them with exemplary projects that have been proven successful in other school districts around the country. The DFP provides coordination and technical assistance, services that help to assure successful implementation in the new location. Evaluation of this project was designed to measure the degree to which stated services were provided and the degree of satisfaction felt by the recipients of the services. Services of the DFP include: (1) information dissemination; (2) identification of needs; and (3) staff training sessions. Results of this evaluation indicate that the DFP is successfully serving the needs of the local and private schools. This report describes the background and objectives of the program, the evaluation design, evaluation results, and recommendations. Appendices present illustrations of the adoption process, sessions held, programs in operation, a project survey, and comments on the survey. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198070

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DISTRICT FACILITATOR PROJECT
E. S. E. A. TITLE IV-C

Final Evaluation Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Cooper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

VINCENT E. REED
Superintendent of Schools

January 1980

SP 015 804

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DISTRICT FACILITATOR PROJECT

Final Report

1979

Prepared by
Division of Research and Evaluation

MAR 1 4 1980

DISTRICT FACILITATOR PROJECT

Susan Williams, Project Director

DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Mildred P. Cooper	Assistant Superintendent
June Bland	Assistant for Evaluation

TITLE IV-PART C EVALUATION UNIT

Lavolia Vails	Director
Marcis McBeath	Education Research Assistant
Mark Arenas	Research Assistant
Virginia Wise	Administrative Clerk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
SUMMARY	vi
Chapter	
I. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES	1
Purpose	1
Need	1
History	1
Description of Project	1
Stated Primary Functions	2
II. EXTERNAL EVALUATION DESIGN	3
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	3
Activities	3
Awareness Sessions	4
Identification of Needs	4
Training Sessions	4
Programs in Operation	6
Questionnaire	7
Respondent Information	7
Services Received	8
Value of Services	10
Continuation of Services	11
Primary Functions Represented	11
Comments	13
Findings	13
IV. CONCLUSIONS	15
V. EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS	15

VI APPENDIXES

Page

A. Adoption/Adaption Process 17

B. District Facilitator Project Awareness Sessions Held 19

C. Training Sessions 21

D. Programs in Operation 24

E. District Facilitator Project Survey 26

F. Comments from District Facilitator Project Survey 28

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
I	Representation of Groups at District Facilitator Training Sessions by Region and Grade Level	6
II	Representation of District Facilitator Projects in Operation by Region and Grade Level	6
III	Questionnaires Returned	8
IV	Rank Order of District Facilitator Project Services Reported	9
V	Reported Value of District Facilitator Project Services Received	10
VI	Relationship of Frequency of Services Received to Primary Function	12

SUMMARY

Title

District Facilitator Project

Project Director

Susan Williams

Project Location

Project headquarters are located at 1101 Fifteenth Street, N.W. - Suite LL-70. Programs under this project are located in schools in all the regions of the District of Columbia Public Schools.

Target Population

Teachers and administrators of the District of Columbia Public Schools and the District of Columbia Non-Public Schools

Background

The District Facilitator Project works through an Office of Education system called the National Diffusion Network which introduces nationally validated projects to local school districts. The project began in the District during the 1977-78 school year, with 1978-79 being the first full year of its operation.

Description of the Program

In cooperation with Developer/Demonstrator projects and local schools, the District Facilitator Project provides services to interested teachers and administrators through a five-step process consisting of: (1) Awareness; (2) Interest; (3) Pilot adoption; (4) Evaluation; and (5) Adoption/Adaption.

The school or region may apply through the District Facilitator Project for minigrants to cover the cost of training and materials.

Evaluation

Evaluation was designed to measure the degree to which stated services were provided and the stated satisfaction of the recipients of the services.

Findings

1. The District Facilitator Project provides four types of services:
   a. Awareness Sessions
   b. Identification of needs and selection of program
   c. Training Sessions
   d. Technical assistance to schools while they are installing a new program.
2. The results of the analysis of the degree to which services were provided show that all of the stated services were provided in all of the Regions with representation at both Elementary and Secondary Schools and at non-public schools.
3. Two hundred and sixty-nine teachers and administrators attended five awareness sessions covering 21 different projects of which 11 were eventually adopted in the District.
4. Thirty-one local training sessions were held dealing with 24 different programs.
5. Twenty-one adoptions of 13 different programs are presently in operation at individual schools or regions.
6. Eighteen additional groups who have received training will begin operation in the fall of 1979.
7. All services listed on the survey were reported by the 48 participants who responded, as being received with varying frequency.
8. From 82.2% to 100% of those responding found the services to be valuable.
9. Responses concerning continuation of services were equally distributed for all listed services and showed no relationship to either "service received" or "value of services."

10. The services that the District Facilitator Project most frequently provides represent all of the primary stated functions of the proposal.

Conclusions

1. THE FACILITATOR PROJECT SERVES THE ENTIRE DISTRICT.

2. THE MAJORITY OF THE PILOT PROJECTS EMPHASIZED MATH AND READING, AND COMPETENCY BASED CURRICULUM.

3. ALL STATED PRIMARY FUNCTIONS OF THE DISTRICT FACILITATOR PROJECT WERE FULFILLED.

4. DATA SHOWED THAT PROJECT PERSONNEL PERCEIVED THE PROJECT AS BEING SUCCESSFUL.

5. DATA SHOWED THAT PROJECT PERSONNEL PERCEIVED THEIR ADOPTED NATIONALLY-VALIDATED PROGRAMS AS BEING EFFECTIVE.

BACKGROUND AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Introduction

Purpose - The purpose of the DISTRICT FACILITATOR PROJECT is to assist local schools to improve their programs by linking them with exemplary projects that have been proven successful in other school districts around the country. The DFP provides coordination and technical assistance, services that help to assure successful implementation in the new location.

Need - Dynamic changes in the techniques and technology of education make it difficult for local school districts to keep abreast of the best current practices. The DFP provides the mechanisms by which the District of Columbia meets this need.

History - Planning for the project began with part of the funding coming from the office of Education through a system called the National Diffusion Network which has been in operation since 1974 to promote the application of nationally validated projects to local school districts. The original proposal for the District of Columbia Schools was written by the Network of Innovative schools in January, 1977. Funding under the National Diffusion Network provided for a part-time director who began working in October 1977. Title IV-C funding increased the time to full-time as of December 1977. From January to May, 1978, six awareness sessions and two training sessions were held in the District. During 1978-79 the project has been in operation for its first full year.

Description of the Project

District Facilitator Project services are available to all of the District of Columbia Public and Non-Public Schools.

In cooperation with Developer/Demonstrator projects and local schools, the DFP leads interested teachers and administrators through a five-step process. The steps are: (1) Awareness; (2) Interest; (3) Pilot adoption; (4) Evaluation; and (5) Adoption/Adaption. Services include awareness workshops; needs assessment; in-service training; on-site consultation with on-going technical assistance during the pilot adoption phase; and follow-up assistance.

When an exemplary project is installed it is called an adoption. Local schools and regions may apply for Title IV-C minigrants to cover the cost of training and materials. The average adoption cost per project in the District of Columbia Public Schools is $1,200.

Stated Primary Functions

A. To disseminate information about Developer/Demonstrator (D/D) projects and other resources of the National Diffusion Network, including services that can be provided by the District Facilitator Project

B. To assist schools in identifying their needs and in selecting an appropriate D/D program

C. To arrange for D/D training for those schools that elect to adopt programs

D. To provide technical assistance to schools while they are installing a new program.

EXTERNAL EVALUATION DESIGN

Evaluation of this project was designed to measure the degree to which stated services were provided and the stated satisfaction by the recipients of the services.

The first analysis is a review of records of services provided to the District of Columbia teachers and administrators by the District Facilitator. The records were checked for information which supported the stated primary functions, e.g. awareness sessions for dissemination, and training sessions to prepare for adoption of programs. Also included is a breakdown of representation by region and grade level at training sesssions and of projects in operation.

The second analysis involves an examination of responses to a questionnaire designed by the project director to determine satisfaction with facilitator project services. This analysis includes the percentage of return on the questionnaire; percentage of projects represented; percentage of participants represented; a breakdown of responses according to school, program, and staff; rank order of services reported; percentage of respondents perceiving the services as of value; and the relationship of frequency of services received to primary functions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Activities

The District Facilitator functions as the link between the State Educational Agency and the Developer/Demonstrator. Each of the three has a role throughout the adoption process (See Appendix A).

Four types of services are provided by the District Facilitator Project:

1. Arranging for Awareness Sessions
2. Assisting in identification of needs and selection of program
3. Arranging for Training Sessions
4. Providing technical assistance to schools while they are installing a new program.

Awareness Sessions - Awareness Sessions are held to disseminate information about Developer/Demonstrator projects and other resources of the National Diffusion Network. The Awareness Sessions include information on services that can be provided by the District Facilitator Project.

During the 1978-79 year five Awareness Sessions were held on six days familiarizing those who attended with 21 different projects. (See Appendix B). These sessions were attended by 269 District of Columbia teachers and administrators. They covered areas such as reading and language arts, mathematics, early childhood, and Special Education. Enough interest was created by these Awareness Sessions that 11 of the 23 were followed up with training sessions and adoption.

Identification of Needs - The District Facilitator works with the school or region to identify priorities, examine the range of possible programs, and select the most appropriate one(s). All of the projects in operation were preceded by this service.

Training Sessions - When a school or region is ready to adopt a project, an agreement for training is set up which includes identification of a primary contact person, identification of the staff to be trained, cost distribution, and an evaluation of the adoption process. This comprises a minigrant proposal. Arrangements are made for the staff to receive training. The training may occur at the Developer/Demonstrator site, at the

proposed adoption site, or both. During the 1978-79 year, 31 local training sessions were held dealing with 24 different programs. Some of the sessions were attended by more than one group with 37 groups receiving the training. The sessions lasted from 1-5 days. (See Appendix C).

Participants of the training sessions came from all Regions of the District of Columbia Public Schools. Both elementary and secondary levels were represented. Non-public schools also received training at all levels. In addition to training sessions for each region, four were held that were city-wide. (See Table I).

Table I

Representation of Groups at District Facilitator Training Sessions by Region and Grade Level

Grade Level	Region I	II	III	IV	V	VI	All Region	Non Public	Total
Elementary		3		3	2	2	1	4	15
Secondary	2	2	5	1	3	2		1	16
All Levels		1				2	3		6
Total	2	6	5	4	5	6	4	5	37

Programs in Operation - When a program is installed, it is called an adoption. Twenty-one adoptions of 13 different programs are presently in operation at individual schools or region-wide. (See Appendix D).

Eighteen additional groups who have received training will begin operation in the fall of 1979. Programs are represented in all regions and levels of the District and in non-public schools. (See Table II)

Table II

Representation of District Facilitator Projects in Operation by Region and Grade Level

Grade Level	Region I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Non Public	Total
Elementary		2		3	2	2	3	12
Secondary	1		3	1	2			7
All Levels						2		2
Total	1	2	3	4	4	4	3	21

Questionnaire

The questionnaire lists 14 services. (See Appendix E)

These services represent a breakdown of the four primary functions: Awareness, Identification, Training, and Technical assistance. The questionnaire is designed to determine services received and the perceived value of those services.

Respondent Information - One hundred and sixty-five (165) questionnaires were sent to 16 project coordinators. Forty-eight (48) were returned from 13 schools. However, 100 of the questionnaires were not distributed to project participants. Thus, 62% of the projects were represented with a 74% return on questionnaires distributed, representing 29% of the participants.

A breakdown of responses according to school, program and staff may be seen in Table III.

Table III

Questionnaires Returned

Schools	Projects	Teachers	Administrators	Unidentified
Clark	Precision Teaching	6	1	
Dunbar	DEEP	1		
Edmonds-Peabody	Talents Unlimited	3	1	1
Friendship	ECRI	5		
Hart	ECRI	3	1	1
Johnson	ECRI	1		
Lenox	Dale Avenue	1		
Macfarland	Pegasus Pace	2		2
Macfarland	Project Stamm	4		
Region III	Right to Read		1	
St. Peters	Alphaphonics	1		
St. Peters	Dale Avenue	1		
J.O. Wilson	EPSF Project	1		
Winston	ECRI	5		
H.D. Woodson	Project Stamm	6		
Total		40	4	4

Services Received - All services listed were reported as being received with varying frequency. Services were ranked from most frequently reported to least frequently reported. (See Table IV). Services number 5 and 8, (Appendix E. p. 26) "Arrange visit by program developers to our school/ region," and "Develop with us a plan for adopting a program" were those reported with the highest frequency.

Table IV

Rank Order of DFP Services Reported

Rank Order	Original Order on Survey	DFP Service
(1	5.	Arrange visit by program developers to our school/region.
(1	8.	Develop with us a plan for adopting a program.
(2	4.	Show us materials on particular programs.
(2	9.	Provide staff of my school/region free inservice training in the program we adopted.
3	12.	Visit our school/region after we begin to use the adopted program
(4	2.	Visit my school/region/division to explain DFP to staff
(4	13.	Arrange a visit by the program developers after we begin to use the adopted program
5	7.	Arrange presentations by program developers at a conference
6	10.	Provide my school a free copy of all program materials
7	1.	Mail newsletters on SFP to my school/region/division
8	14.	Arrange communication with other adopters of the same program
9	3.	Give free copy of Educational Programs that Work
10	11.	Provide my school with help in writing a proposal to fund the adoption
11	6.	Share the cost of our travel to program site

Value of Services - Responses were uniformly positive. Depending upon the service, 88.2% to 100% of those responding found the services to be of value or of great value. (See Table V).

Table V

Reported Value of DFP Services Received

DFP Service	Of great value	Of value	Of little or no value
1. Mail newsletters on DFP to my school/ region/division	40.9%	59.1%	-
2. Visit my school/region/division to explain DFP to staff	75.5%	24.5%	-
3. Give free copy of Educational Programs that Work	57.8%	42.2%	-
4. Show us materials on particular programs	65.7%	34.3%	-
5. Arrange visit by program developers to our school/region	75.0%	25.0%	-
6. Share the cost of our travel to program site	71.4%	21.6%	7.0%
7. Arrange presentations by program developers at a conference	70.3%	29.7%	-
8. Develop with us a plan for adopting a program	60.6%	36.3%	3.1%
9. Provide staff of my school/region free inservice training in the program we adopted	81.2%	15.6%	3.2%
10. Provide my school a free copy of all program materials	70.8%	29.2%	-
11. Provide my school with help in writing a proposal to fund the adoption	58.8%	29.4%	11.8%
12. Visit our school/region after we begin to use the adopted program	54.8%	38.7%	6.5%
13. Arrange a visit by the program developers after we begin to use the adopted program	70.0%	23.3%	6.7%
14. Arrange communication with other adopters of the same program	47.6%	42.8%	9.6%

Continuation of Services - Respondents were requested to check the "continue" column for those services they believed DFP should continue to provide. Responses were evenly distributed for all listed services. There was no apparent relationship between "continue" responses and either "service received" or "value of services."

Primary Functions Represented - The primary functions of the District Facilitator Project are: (1) Arranging for awareness sessions; (2) Assisting in identification of needs and selection of program; (3) Arranging for Training Sessions; and (4) Providing technical assistance.

An analysis of the responses to the questionnaire referring to services received, shows that the primary functions are equally distrubuted among the services most frequently reported. All primary functions are represented by the four services most often received. Table VI shows that relationship.

Table VI

Relationship of Frequency of Services
Received to Primary Function

Rank Order	DFP Service	Primary Function*
(1	Arrange visit by program developers to our school/region	C, D
(1	Develop with us a plan for adopting a program	B
(2	Show us materials on particular programs	A, B
(2	Provide staff of my school/region free inservice training in the program we adopted	C
3	Visit our school/region after we begin to use the adopted program	D
(4	Visit my school/region/division to explain DFP to staff	A
(4	Arrange a visit by the program developers after we begin to use the adopted program	D
5	Arrange presentations by program developers at a conference	A, B
6	Provide my school a free copy of all program materials	C
7	Mail newsletters on DFP to my school/region/division	A
8	Arrange communication with other adopters of the same program	D
9	Give free copy of Educational Programs that Work	A, B
10	Provide my school with help in writing a proposal to fund the adoption	B
11	Share the cost of our travel to program site	B, D

* A. Arranging for Awareness Sessions

B. Assisting in identification of needs and selection of program

C. Arranging for Training Sessions

D. Providing technical assistance

Comments - Comments were written on 14 of the 48 questionnaires. (See Appendix F). Comments were generally positive such as "Excellent service and program." Some of the participants offered recommendations or questions such as "What is the possibility of one or two of us getting a chance to see Precision Teaching in operation at a very good adoption center?" Some respondents made positive comments and also included recommendations such as, "ECRI is a beautiful program and my kids adapted well to the aspects of the program I introduced. However, I'd like to see schools provide more of the materials needed to implement the program completely - namely, books on graded level of the child and chart paper." Special note was made of the service provided by the project director such as "Everyone connected with the DFP was very helpful, especially all contacts I had with Susan Williams."

Findings

1. The District Facilitator Project provides four types of services:
   a. Awareness Sessions
   b. Identification of needs and selection of program
   c. Training Sessions
   d. Technical assistance to schools while they are installing a new program.
2. The results of the analysis of the degree to which services were provided show that all of the stated services were provided in all of the Regions with representation at both Elementary and Secondary Schools and at non-public schools.
3. Two hundred and sixty-nine teachers and administrators attended five awareness sessions covering 21 different projects, of which 11 were eventually adopted in the District.
4. Thirty-one local training sessions were held dealing with 24 different programs.
5. Twenty-one adoptions of 13 different programs are presently in operation at individual schools or regions.

6. Eighteen additional groups who have received training will begin operation in the fall of 1979.

7. All services listed on the survey were reported by the 48 participants who responded, as being received with varying frequency.

8. From 82.2% to 100% of those responding found the services to be valuable.

9. Responses concerning continuation of services were equally distributed for all listed services and showed no relationship to either "service received" or "value of services."

10. The services that the District Facilitator Project most frequently provides represent all of the primary stated functions of the proposal.

CONCLUSIONS

1. THE FACILITATOR PROJECT SERVES THE ENTIRE DISTRICT. Services were provided for projects in schools in all six districts, regional projects, city-wide projects and projects in non-public schools.

2. THE MAJORITY OF THE PILOT PROJECTS EMPHASIZED MATH AND READING, AND COMPETENCY BASED CURRICULUM. These areas of emphasis coincide with the educational direction of the District of Columbia Public Schools.

3. ALL STATED PRIMARY FUNCTIONS OF THE DISTRICT FACILITATOR PROJECT WERE FULFILLED. Awareness sessions were held, assistance was given in identification of needs and selection of programs, arrangements were made for training, and technical assistance was given while projects were being installed.

4. DATA SHOWED THAT PROJECT PERSONNEL PERCEIVED THE PROJECT AS BEING SUCCESSFUL. They indicated that the DFP was effective in providing the services relating to the adoption process. They reported that the services received were of value to them.

5. DATA SHOWED THAT PROJECT PERSONNEL PERCEIVED THEIR ADOPTED NATIONALLY-VALIDATED PROGRAMS AS BEING EFFECTIVE. Project personnel were pleased with the effect of the programs on student skill development and study habits.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EVALUATION

Changes in the format of the survey instrument were discussed with the project director. This modification will yield data in areas where analysis was not feasible with the present instrument.

APPENDIX A

Adoption/Adaption Process

Adoption/Adaption Process

	STATE FACILITATOR (DFP)	DEMONSTRATOR (D/O)	LOCAL ED. AGENCY (LEA)
Awareness	Disseminates awareness materials, receives requests and invites potential adopters to review programs, schedules awareness conferences.	Provides DFP with awareness and sample program materials, participates in awareness conferences.	Receives awareness material, identifies programs for potential adoption, attends regional awareness conferences, returns expression of interest to DFP.
Interest	Contacts project directors to assess ability to handle new adoptions, distributes materials on specific projects to LEA's requesting them, helps adopters prepare financial and adoption agreement forms.	Provides DFP with detailed information on requested projects, is available to answer specific questions, hosts on-site visits of interest to LEA personnel.	Involves school personnel and parents in focusing on projects for exploration, works with DFP to apply for financial assistance.
Pilot Adoption	Organizes support groups of adopters, arranges training, provides consultant services and other on-going technical assistance needed to aid the LEA in exploring the project.	Offers on-site evaluation, helps in assessing suitability, supervises and actively assists the LEA during the pilot period through training and technical assistance.	Makes decision to adopt/adapt a project, meets with DFP to negotiate technical assistance needed, participates in training, begins implementation.
Evaluation	Provides technical assistance for impact assessment.	Provides expertise on instruments for impact assessment, provides assistance in modifying the project to fit better the pilot setting of the individual LEA.	Chooses an evaluator, studies the results of the evaluation, involves school personnel and parents in decision to adopt, drop, or adapt.
Adoption/Adaption	Provides technical assistance as requested by LEA (on diminished scale).	Provides occasional technical assistance as requested by the LEA.	Becomes the site for the successful project, assumes the responsibility and costs of integrating the project into the total school or system, becomes the focal point for other interested schools in the district.

APPENDIX B

District Facilitator Project Awareness Sessions Held

DISTRICT FACILITATOR PROJECT

AWARENESS SESSIONS HELD

Dates	Project	No. Participants
11/13,14/78	Alphaphonics	450 (attended entire conference 85 from D.C.)
	COPE	
	Early Prevention of School Failure	
	New Adventure	
	Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction	
	HOSTS	
	Individualized Language Arts	
	Project Catch-Up	
	Reading/English Rotation Project	
	STAMM	
	Vocational Reading Power (VRP)	
	Diversified Educational Experiences Program (DEEP)	
	Focus Dissemination Project	
	Curriculum for Meeting Modern Problems	
	Alternative Learning Project (ALP)	
	Project Adventure	
	Media Now	
	School Volunteer Development Project	
	Talents Unlimited	
4/3/79	Early Prevention of School Failure	22
4/26/79	Vocational Reading Power	38
4/27/79	STAMM	47

APPENDIX C

Training Sessions

Training Sessions

Developer/ Demonstrator	School/Region	Dates
1. Alphaphonics	Takoma School Tubman School St. Peter's School	8/11/78
2. Dale Avenue Early Childhood Program	Lenox School St. Peter's School	8/14/78
3. CSMP Math	Oyster Bi-lingual	8/14-18/78
4. STAMM	MacFarland	8/16,18/78
5. Early Prevention of School Failure	J.O. Wilson School	9/5,6/78
6. Right to Read Wilson Jr. High	Region III (35 secondary teachers)	9/28,29/78
7. E.C.R.I.	Region I (19 secondary teachers)	10/3-7/78
8. I.L.A.	Region VI	10/16/78
9. Pegasus-Pace	MacFarland Jr. High	10/17-19/78
10. Precision Teaching Project	Clark Elementary	11/28-30/28
11. STAMM	Woodson Sr. High	11/14,15/78
12. Talents Unlimited	Edmonds-Peabody Holy Name	12/7,8/78
13. I.L.A.	Region VI	1/5/79
14. Right to Read Wilson Jr. High	Region III (17 secondary teachers)	2/14/79
15. Alphaphonics	Region VI (28 Teachers)	4/17/79
16. Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration Center	Regions II, III	5/7-9/79
17. E.C.R.I. (Follow-Up Training)	Region I	5/7,8/79

Training Sessions (continued)

Developer/ Demonstrator	School/Region	Dates
18. Perception +	Region II Training	5/18/79
19. School Volunteer Project	Citywide Local School Coordinators Training	5/22/79
20. Alphaphonics	Region II	5/31/79
21. Media Now	Fletcher-Johnson	6/4-5/79
22. Rutland Center for Developmental Therapy	Region VI Initial Training	6/6/79
23. Project DEEP	Region IV Junior High Training	6/6-8/79
24. Precision Teaching Project	Region II Training	6/11-13/79
25. Individualized Language Arts I.L.A.	Title I	6/15/79
26. Vocational Reading Power (Wilson)	Region II	6/18-20/79
27. School Volunteer Project	Training for Regional Coordinators	6/20,21/79
28. Exemplary Center for Reading instruction	Citywide Secondary Training for Content Area Specialists	6/25-29/79
29. Rutland Center for Developmental Therapy	Region VI Training and Joseph P. Kennedy Institute	8/20-8/22
30. Dale Avenue Early Childhood Educational Project	Holy Name School	8/23
31. Project STAMM	Region V	8/27-29

APPENDIX D

Programs in Operation

Programs in Operation

Developer/Demonstrator	School/Region
1. Alphaphonics	Janney
2. Project DEEP	Dunbar Sr. High
3. Alphaphonics	Takoma School Tubman School St. Peter's School
4. Dale Avenue Early Childhood Program	Lenox School St. Peter's School
5. CSMP Math	Oyster Bi-lingual
6. STAMM	MacFarland
7. Early Prevention of School Failure	J.O. Wilson School
8. Right to Read Wilson Jr. High	Region III
9. E.C.R.I.	Region I
10. I.L.A.	Region VI
11. Pegasus-Pace	MacFarland Jr. High
12. Precision Teaching Project	Clark Elementary
13. STAMM	Woodson Sr. High
14. Talents Unlimited	Edmonds-Peabody Holy Name
15. I.L.A.	Region VI
16. Right to Read Wilson Jr. High	Region III
17. Alphaphonics	Region VI

APPENDIX E

District Facilitator Project Survey

DISTRICT FACILITATOR PROJECT SURVEY

I am a ( ) administrator ( ) teacher ( ) other educator

in a ( ) public school. ( ) private school. ( ) other education agency.

Program adopted _____ School/Region/Division _____

For each DFP service listed below, check those services you received in the (√) column. Then rate each service you received in the "value" column. Put a (√) in the "continue" column for those services you believe DFP should continue to provide.

√	DFP Service	of great value	of value	of little or no value	continue
	1. Mail newsletters on DFP to my school/region/division				
	2. Visit my school/region/division to explain DFP to staff				
	3. Give free copy of Educational Programs that Work				
	4. Show us materials on particular programs				
	5. Arrange visit by program developers to our school/region				
	6. Share the cost of our travel to program site				
	7. Arrange presentations by program developers at a conference				
	8. Develop with us a plan for adopting a program				
	9. Provide staff of my school/region free inservice training in the program we adopted				
	10. Provide my school a free copy of all program materials				
	11. Provide my school with help in writing a proposal to fund the adoption				
	12. Visit our school/region after we began to use the adopted program				
	13. Arrange a visit by the program developers after we began to use the adopted program				
	14. Arrange communication with other adopters of the same program				

Please make any comments regarding DFP or its services here _____

APPENDIX F

Comments From District Facilitator Project Survey

Comments from the District Facilitator Project Survey

"What is the possibility of one or two of us getting a chance to see Precision Teaching in operation at a very good adoption center?"

"Our State Facilitator, Susan Williams, has regularly communicated with me during this year of adoption of the ECRI program and has made every effort to help us succeed in program implementation. The regional instructional office and program participants are highly impressed with the quality and extent of services rendered."

"I feel it to be a good program, wish more staff could share in it"

"DFP has been of great value in the Science Department."

"I have found the parts of the program that I have used very helpful."

"Immediate and positive follow-up, if needed, as well as assurance that the program or portions of it can be utilized in the classroom meaningfully. The package is too extensive to absorb or to implement during one school year. Preparation time must be allowed."

"The ECRI program was very informative. More classes should be offered by DFP and presented in the classrooms. Too few people (teachers, administrators etc.) are familiar with your services. Maybe some type of awareness program should be given in September."

"Skills used in ECRI methods and techniques have helped some of my students improve their word perception skills. Also this technique has taught them how to study."

"ECRI is a beautiful program and my kids adapted well to the aspects of the program I introduced. However, I'd like to see the schools provide more of the materials needed to implement the program completely - namely books on graded level of the child, and chart paper."

"Excellent service and program."

"The program will probably not survive without funding."

"Everyone connected with the DFP was very helpful especially all contact I had with Susan Williams."

"I have been very impressed by the level of professionalism of the office. I felt that Susan Williams in particular followed through with all promises and took a personal interest in helping the program be a success."

"Hopefully we will get more involved next year."